

GAO

Briefing Report to the Chairman,
Committee on Governmental Affairs, U.S.
Senate

November 1987

WELFARE

Summary of Administrative Problems Discussed in Past GAO Reports



RESTRICTED—Not to be released outside the General
Accounting Office except on the basis of the specific approval
by the Office of Congressional Relations.

540673



•



Human Resources Division

B-225966

November 27, 1987

The Honorable John Glenn
Chairman, Committee on Governmental
Affairs
United States Senate

Dear Mr. Chairman:

On July 7, 1987, noting that the Congress was considering welfare reform proposals, you requested that we (1) summarize the administrative problems discussed in our past reports on welfare and (2) provide questions that we believe should be asked concerning welfare reform proposals. As agreed with your office, we reviewed reports we issued from October 1, 1984, to August 14, 1987 (see app. I), on the following types of programs: Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC), Food Stamp, food relief, Medicaid, health care, public assistance, and employment or training.

Twenty-seven of our reports discuss 54 administrative problems, which we address in this report under one of seven categories.

- Regulating. Problems included (1) legislative and oversight responsibilities scattered among many entities and (2) lack of consistency between programs in terminology and definitions (of such items as income and assets), eligibility criteria, eligibility verification procedures, quality control procedures, and administrative requirements, including reporting. These problems made it difficult for states to integrate program services and resulted in complexity, increased costs, and inefficiencies.
- Coordinating. Problems that impeded coordination among programs included (1) differing legislation, rules, funding systems, and operations; (2) lack of agreements between state agencies to coordinate services; and (3) different program objectives. These problems also made it difficult for states to integrate program services.
- Monitoring. Problems included (1) failure of program administrators to adequately monitor and evaluate their programs, (2) lack of program effectiveness reviews, (3) lack of program quality control systems, and (4) poor case management, including insufficient use of case tracking.

- Reporting. Problems included federal agencies' receiving program data from the states that were not uniform or consistent and could not be used to determine how the states were performing. More specific data collection and reporting requirements were needed.
- Staffing. Problems included staffing shortages at the federal, state, or local levels that resulted in service shortfalls, curtailment of the number of program participants served, low staff morale, loss of program expertise, and program delays.
- Automating. Problems included the potential breach of clients' privacy in computer matching and insufficient guidelines for safeguarding privacy of personal data.
- Funding. Problems included insufficient funds to serve all eligible clients (e.g., weatherize all eligible dwelling units) and variations between states in funding for AFDC recipients.

For each of the categories, we have suggested questions (some apply to more than one administrative problem) that could be asked in considering the adequacy and workability of the administrative requirements in welfare reform legislation.

- - - - -

Because our review consisted of analyzing issued GAO reports, we did not obtain formal agency comments on this report. As agreed, unless you publicly announce the contents earlier, we plan no further distribution of this report until 30 days after its issue date. At that time, we will send copies to other interested parties and make copies available to others who request them.

Should you need further information on the contents of this report, please call me on 275-6193.

Sincerely yours,


Franklin Frazier
Associate Director

C o n t e n t s

	<u>Page</u>
LETTER	1
WELFARE: SUMMARY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS DISCUSSED IN PAST GAO REPORTS	4
Regulating	4
Coordinating	9
Monitoring	11
Reporting	15
Staffing	17
Automating	19
Funding	21

APPENDIX

I	GAO Welfare Reports by Division	23
---	---------------------------------	----

ABBREVIATIONS

AFDC	Aid to Families With Dependent Children
GAO	General Accounting Office
HHS	Department of Health and Human Services
HRD	Human Resources Division
OCSE	Office of Child Support Enforcement
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
PEMD	Program Evaluation and Methodology Division
RCED	Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
WIC	Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children

WELFARE: SUMMARY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS
DISCUSSED IN PAST GAO REPORTS

REGULATING

We defined regulating as the process whereby legislators and program administrators establish rules, terminology, guidelines, and procedures for administering federal welfare programs.

Problems

Questions

Assignment of responsibilities

Legislative, oversight, and administrative responsibilities for welfare programs have been scattered among many entities. Welfare is often criticized as complex, costly, and inefficient.
(GAO/HRD-87-51BR, pp. 2 and 20;
GAO/HRD-87-110FS, p. 27)

Is there potential for consolidating responsibilities into fewer congressional committees and federal or state agencies?

Terminology

Terminology and definitions--for such eligibility factors as income and assets--differ between welfare programs, making it difficult for states to integrate services, such as by coapplication and coeligibility determination for services.
(GAO/HRD-87-110FS, p. 30;
GAO/HRD-87-51BR, p. 19)

Are terminology and definitions uniform between programs? If there are differences, is there justification for the differences?

Problems

Specific definitions were not established for certain data elements relating to the Job Training Partnership Act program. For example, a uniform definition of a school dropout had not been established. As a result, data that states accumulated were not reliably interpreted or compared across states.

(GAO/HRD-86-69BR, p. 2;
GAO/HRD-86-106BR, pp. 12-13)

Questions

Is there a need to require specific definitions of key data elements so that comparable data can be accumulated and used in program administration and evaluations?

Requirements

Complex requirements for welfare programs, including those for eligibility determinations, make it difficult for states to integrate welfare services. (GAO/HRD-87-110FS, pp. 25 and 32)

Differences between welfare programs in (1) eligibility criteria, (2) eligibility verification procedures, (3) quality control procedures, and (4) administrative requirements make it difficult to integrate welfare services. (GAO/HRD-87-110FS, pp. 25 and 28-30)

Among welfare programs, requirements differ for verifying data provided by clients. Overlapping verification efforts could be avoided if there was agreement on what data should be verified, who should verify it, and how.

- (GAO/HRD-85-22, p. iv)

Is there a need for simplified requirements that are more uniform between programs so that administration and integration of welfare services will be easier and more efficient?

Is more uniformity needed, especially for (1) eligibility criteria, (2) eligibility verification, (3) quality control, and (4) administrative requirements, including reporting?

Same as above.

Problems

Differences in requirements for program and financial reporting between welfare programs were detrimental to effective service integration.

(GAO/HRD-87-110FS, pp. 27, 28, and 44; GAO/HRD-87-51BR, p. 19)

Problems commonly identified in literature on teenage pregnancy and in a 50-state survey included agency rivalries, incompatible procedures, and a lack of coordination between existing services. Simplified administrative procedures seemed justified by (1) experience with programs that require extensive coordination across agencies and funding sources and (2) concerns about teenage pregnancy programs. (GAO/PEMD-86-16BR, pp. 24 and 28)

Focusing on issues the Congress will need to address in evaluating proposed welfare reform, we reported that a federal interagency project had revealed that paperwork requirements were burdensome to state and local program administrators. (GAO/HRD-87-51BR, pp. 19 and 21)

Questions

Same as above

Does proposed legislation prescribe administrative procedures that encourage cooperation between programs, services, and administering agencies?

Concerning eligibility determination, data verification, and reporting requirements, is there a need to lessen the paperwork of program administrators and caseworkers in state or local government?

Problems

The Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food and Nutrition Service had not established specific guidelines for documenting and verifying the income and family size of applicants for the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC). Procedures for determining income eligibility varied between states and localities and were not adequate to ensure that only income-eligible applicants obtained benefits.

(GAO/RCED-85-105, p. iii)

For the WIC program, USDA allowed each state to set the criteria for determining persons at "nutritional risk." The criteria included factors that were unreliable and had potential for variability and overuse. Uniform factors are needed to ensure applicants have equitable access to the program.

(GAO/RCED-85-105, p. iii)

For the WIC program, the Food and Nutrition Service had not (1) emphasized targeting of benefits as an objective, (2) encouraged states to emphasize targeting, and (3) assessed targeting performance in management evaluations. Not all states targeted benefits to the most vulnerable eligibles.

(GAO/RCED-85-105, p. i)

Questions

For individual programs, are there provisions for requiring the appropriate federal agency to establish uniform guidelines and procedures for use by state and local governments in documenting and verifying income and family size for applicants? If provisions do not exist, why have uniform guidelines not been established? What safeguards are proposed to ensure that state-set guidelines are appropriate?

Is there a need to set uniform eligibility criteria for states to use in the WIC program?

Is adequate emphasis given to targeting benefits (including provision for assessing targeting performance) to priority groups?

Problems

Federal procedures for obtaining waivers of requirements for programs affected by welfare demonstration projects were so time-consuming that states believed approvals may come too late in the implementation phase to be of any value. (GAO/HRD-86-125BR, p. 11)

The Rural Housing Amendments of 1983 required that USDA's Farmers Home Administration revise the income limits for its loans. However, the agency did not issue regulations adopting new limits until October 1, 1985, and continued to use the old income limits in 1984 and 1985. (GAO/RCED-86-33, p. 25)

Questions

Is there a need to simplify procedures for obtaining waivers of program requirements so that such waiver requests will be encouraged?

Is there a need to specify time limits for issuance of federal regulations to carry out the legislation?

COORDINATING

Coordinating involves federal, state, and local officials working cohesively to develop and carry out welfare programs effectively, efficiently, and economically.

Problems

USDA's 11 domestic food assistance programs have been insufficiently coordinated with each other and with AFDC and Supplemental Security Income programs. Each of these programs has its own authorizing legislation. The programs' differing rules, administrative funding systems, and ways of operation have confused program administrators, participants, and potential participants. (GAO/HRD-87-110FS, p. 36; GAO/RCED-85-109, pp. v and vi)

Most states believe that an obstacle, to a great extent, to states' efforts to achieve service integration is a lack of coordination between (1) federal agencies and programs and (2) the federal government and state and local governments. (GAO/HRD-87-110FS, pp. 25 and 36-37)

Officials from four states who operate demonstration projects for service integration stated that HHS did not clearly communicate and emphasize client self-sufficiency as a primary goal until late in the planning stage. The officials said they had to make major changes to their implementation plans without sufficient time to study client needs and identify all desired outcomes for client target groups. (GAO/HRD-86-125BR, pp. 2 and 9)

Questions

What consideration has been given to consolidating legislation for welfare programs and establishing more similarity between programs' rules, procedures, and funding systems?

To enhance services integration, is there a need to prescribe mechanisms in proposed legislation for achieving coordination between federal agencies and their cooperation with state and local governments?

If demonstration projects are proposed (1) are goals and objectives clearly stated and (2) are there requirements that goals and objectives be clearly communicated by the federal agency to the state and local governments at the outset of the program?

Problems

The Job Training Partnership Act emphasizes that each state should have a coordinated delivery system for employment and job training programs. About half the states, however, had no agreements or arrangements between state agencies to coordinate services under the act with other programs, such as secondary education, vocational training, public assistance, and economic development.

(GAO/HRD-85-4, p. 19)

A competitive, noncooperative relationship existed between state employment services and private employment agencies primarily because the state was concerned that increased referrals to private agencies could lead to displacement of state employment service offices and staff.

(GAO/HRD-86-61, pp. 2-3)

Programs with limited funding, such as the Job Training Partnership Act program, often needed to draw on other programs for services. However, developing cooperative relationships between programs has been a problem in the states.

(GAO/HRD-85-92, pp. 4 and 13)

Questions

To coordinate services from multiple programs, are provisions needed to require agreements between state agencies?

If proposed legislation affects relationships between the state and the private sector, is cooperation between the two sectors encouraged, such as by the provision of referral services?

Have interdependent services between programs been identified? What provisions are proposed to ensure that programs with interdependent services cooperate with each other?

MONITORING

Monitoring includes overseeing program effectiveness; detecting errors, misinformation, and fraud using quality control techniques; promptly correcting errors and collecting benefit overpayments by follow-up actions; and assuring accurate client record maintenance by case management.

Problems

Oversight

Administrators of work programs for AFDC women have documented and evaluated current work initiatives inadequately. (GAO/HRD-85-92; app. I, p. 18)

There is passive or inadequate federal and state oversight of child support enforcement activities. HHS's Office of Inspector General elected not to review the activities of the Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE). OCSE itself reviews state and local enforcement activities only for compliance with procedures and not for effectiveness in meeting program objectives. The states, in turn, limit their role to acting as conduits for data and funds between federal and local child support agencies. (GAO/HRD-87-37, pp. 4 and 47)

Four federal agencies were responsible for establishing administrative requirements for safeguarding personal data. We found that federal monitoring of states' compliance with these requirements was inadequate. (GAO/HRD-85-22, p. 38)

Questions

Is there a need for more specific requirements for monitoring and evaluating programs?

Is there a need to require that federal and state oversight activities assess the effectiveness of program activities, in addition to determining compliance with procedures?

To safeguard personal data on welfare recipients, does the proposed legislation provide for monitoring maintenance, use, and disposal of personal data? Are safeguard requirements provided for in the legislation?

Problems

Questions

Quality control

Not all federal benefit programs have quality control systems. The Pell Grant program (Department of Education) and the Lower-Income Housing Assistance program (Department of Housing and Urban Development) lack comprehensive quality control systems. The programs, therefore, lack statistically valid data on the extent and causes of errors; they would have difficulty effectively directing efforts to reduce erroneous payments.
(GAO/HRD-85-22, pp. 18-21)

USDA's Food and Nutrition Service regulations allowed states to drop cases known to be ineligible for food stamps from the Food Stamp quality control review. Without these cases, review results would not reflect the full extent of each state's errors.
(GAO/RCED-86-195, p. 49)

USDA did not require school districts to expand their verification efforts when high error rates were found in the number of students receiving free and reduced-price meals under the School Lunch and School Breakfast programs. Thus, many ineligible students continued to receive benefits.
(GAO/RCED-86-122BR, p. 1)

Are there provisions for quality control systems for newly proposed program or existing programs that do not have such a system? If not, what other techniques are provided to determine error rates and direct efforts to reduce these rates?

Is there a need for specific quality control requirements?

Same as above.

Problems

Questions

Case management

Because of poor case management and insufficient use of case tracking and monitoring systems, some child support cases were not referred to the local child support agencies by AFDC agencies and referred cases were not always opened; some cases were closed prematurely, and some open cases were left unattended too long.

(GAO/HRD-87-37, pp. 3, 32, and 47)

Child support offices had poor management controls for case records and files on absent parents owing child support.
(GAO/HRD-85-5, p. 1)

Because of poor management practices, local child support agencies made inadequate efforts to get information on absent fathers. This made it difficult to get child support from them.
(GAO/HRD-87-37, p. 47)

Local child support agencies did not act promptly or at all to collect past due amounts from absent parents.
(GAO/HRD-85-5, pp. 2 and 5)

Is there a need to require closer oversight by federal agencies to ensure that adequate case management and tracking procedures are established and followed? Is there a need to specify minimum state or local or both case management requirements?

Same as above.

Same as above.

Same as above.

Problems

Despite several legislative measures and related administrative measures during the 1970's to improve the overall administration of the Food Stamp program, substantial amounts of over-and-under issuances of food stamps have occurred. These issuances have been the result of erroneous eligibility determinations or benefit calculations.

(GAO-RCED-85-109, pp. 5-6)

State agencies were not taking action soon enough after overpayments to Food Stamp recipients were identified. Thus, many recipients left the rolls and did not repay the benefits received in error.

(GAO/RCED-86-17, p. 3)

One state erroneously denied or terminated some Food Stamp program benefits. Local offices did not have a follow-up procedure to restore these benefits.

(GAO/RCED-87-51, pp. 1 and 8)

Questions

Is there a need for greater emphasis on documenting eligibility determinations and benefit calculations? Are the type and extent of verification needed specified? Are limits set on data collection and verification to protect the privacy of the individual?

Is there a need to specify overpayment recoupment procedures to conserve scarce resources?

Is there a need to specify procedures to correct erroneously denied or terminated benefits to ensure those eligible are served?

REPORTING

Reporting includes providing reports, documentation, and data required by federal legislation or agency regulations or procedures or both.

Problems

We reviewed block grant programs for 13 states authorized by the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981. Federal agencies were empowered to, but did not, prescribe the form or content of reports the states were required by law to submit on the intended use of block grant funds and on actual expenditures and activities. As a result, the agencies (1) received data from the states that were not uniform or consistent and (2) could not determine how the states were performing. (GAO/HRD-85-36, pp. 21, 35, and 41)

In January 1986, the Department of Labor proposed revisions to its data collection system for the Job Training Partnership Act program. These revisions should eliminate many shortcomings in reporting on the program. Not addressed, however, were (1) data inconsistencies between service delivery areas that may result in nonrepresentative national estimates of job participant characteristics and termination outcomes and (2) insufficient information to adequately measure the training provided. (GAO/HRD-86-69BR, pp. 2 and 18-20)

Questions

To ensure consistent, comparable data, are there provisions requiring federal agencies to prescribe the format and content of reports to be submitted by program operators?

Are there requirements for uniform data collection across states to allow for national estimates of program progress and outcomes?

Same as above.

Problems

Questions

HHS's Office of Family Assistance did not (1) obtain collective or comparative data from the states on work projects designed to help federal welfare recipients-- primarily single female heads of household--achieve economic self-sufficiency, (2) have standardized reporting formats with consistent data elements, or (3) maintain consistent documentation across projects. (GAO/HRD-85-92, pp. 6, 7, and 18-19)

Same as above.

To promote greater participation by low-income people not on welfare, the Congress amended the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Block Grant by placing additional restrictions on eligibility criteria. States did not compile data on recipient characteristics in a uniform manner, making tracking the effects of the legislative changes virtually impossible. (GAO/HRD-86-92, pp. 2, 7, and 18-19)

Same as above.

The Social Security Act requires HHS to report annually to the Congress on progress toward meeting the social and financial objectives of the Child Support Program. HHS, however, does not gather sufficient data to assess adequately the progress toward meeting the social objectives. In addition, some data in the annual report were based on inaccurate records at the program delivery level. (GAO/HRD-87-37, pp. 4 and 37-40)

Are there provisions requiring that program administrators collect sufficient program data to allow the Congress and the relevant federal agency to assess progress toward meeting program objectives?

STAFFING

Staffing includes hiring, utilizing, supervising, training, and firing personnel in federal, state, and local welfare programs.

Problems

Questions

Federal staffing

The Social Security Act requires OCSE to (1) set standards for state-operated child support programs and (2) hold states and territories accountable for operating an effective program. Yet, OCSE lacked sufficient staff to adequately carry out its audit responsibilities.
(GAO/HRD-87-37, pp. 4 and 34-36)

Is federal staffing (in place or proposed) sufficient to carry out federal responsibilities for administering, monitoring, and evaluating welfare programs?

The Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration reorganized and reduced the staff that had responsibilities for carrying out the Job Training Partnership Act program. The reduction-in-force created potential problems of low staff morale, loss of program expertise, loss of efficiency, and program delays.
(GAO/HRD-85-61, p. 8)

If federal reductions-in-force have occurred, what objectives, services, and administrative functions in the proposed legislation will be adversely affected? If a potential adverse impact is foreseen, what portions of the proposed legislation should be changed to compensate for it?

State and local staffing

State and local OCSE officials informed us that collecting support payments for families not on AFDC was constrained and enforcement actions were delayed because of staff shortages; this was a result, in part, of funding limitations.
(GAO/HRD-85-3, pp. 1 and 8-9)

Are there assurances that staff at state and local agencies will be sufficient to carry out proposed program activities? Should inducements be added to encourage adequate state and local staffing?

Problems

GAO's review focused on how well OCSE was doing in collecting support payments from absent parents. State and local officials informed GAO that staff shortages contributed to service shortfalls and irregular collection efforts. Families not on AFDC were given lower emphasis by the staff because these cases lacked the federal incentive payments and rewards included with AFDC case collections.

(GAO/HRD-85-5, pp. 1 and 6)

We reviewed HHS's work-related demonstration projects, such as workfare, the work incentive program, grant diversion, and job search. We found, in one state, that inadequate staffing because of funding shortages severely curtailed the number of participants served. In another state, programs were delayed because welfare staff had trouble adjusting to new tasks for which they were not trained.

(GAO/HRD-85-92, pp. 4, 10, and 12-13)

Questions

If important administrative functions are not being adequately performed by state and local agencies because of staff shortages, does the proposed legislation consider the shortages? If not, what should be included in the legislation to assure that there are sufficient personnel to carry out important administrative functions?

Given that shortages in staff exist at state and local agencies, what provisions are made in the legislation to train and improve the skills of existing caseworkers and administrative staff?

AUTOMATING

Automating includes using automated data processing to carry out administrative functions, such as determining the eligibility of welfare recipients, verifying data provided by welfare recipients to outside sources, matching separate data bases by computer, and maintaining computer security systems to protect the privacy of recipients.

Problems

Questions

Privacy safeguards

The complexity of the welfare system has led to more computer matching of separate data bases to verify data provided by welfare program applicants and recipients; this, in turn, has raised privacy concerns.
(GAO/HRD-87-51BR, pp. 2-3)

Is there a need for provisions requiring that computer matching include adequate data safeguards to protect the privacy rights of welfare applicants and recipients?

OMB is one of four agencies responsible for establishing requirements for safeguarding the privacy of personal data. We found that OMB's computer matching requirements are inadequate.
(GAO/HRD-85-22, pp. 37-38)

Is there a need to specify computer security guidelines for safeguarding the privacy of personal data and preventing fraud?

Data reliability

Eleven states expressed concern about the usefulness of (1) matching state benefit file data with much older data in the files of the Internal Revenue Service and the Social Security Administration and (2) subsequently investigating case discrepancies that may not be meaningful because of the time differences in the data.
(GAO/HRD-87-79FS, p. 4)

If there is a requirement for computer matching of data files, are there any safeguards that the data used are current and meaningful so as to avoid unnecessary investigations of welfare recipients?

Problems

Questions

Computer systems

The Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 requires states to develop income-verification systems. The states indicated that to meet this requirement resources would have to be diverted from their own system development efforts to operate what they characterized as inefficient, interim systems that would use workers to manually verify case data.

(GAO/HRD-87-79FS, pp. 1 and 3)

If computer systems or changes to them are being proposed, are there provisions to assure that unnecessary and costly interim systems are not used?

FUNDING

Funding includes the processes whereby (1) the Congress authorizes and appropriates funds for welfare programs and (2) the federal agencies dispense funds.

Problems

Federal funding or spending or both have caused spurts of rapid growth in the WIC program. In addition, the USDA Food and Nutrition Service has made changes in fund allocation formulas and tried to recover states' unspent funds and reallocate them to other states. These actions have led to management and spending pressures that have worked against targeting of benefits and orderly, effective caseload management.

(GAO/RCED-85-105, p. iv)

Funding limits under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance program will not enable states to weatherize all eligible dwelling units for many years. In addition, eligibility criteria for the program have been liberalized, thereby increasing the number of units to be weatherized.

(GAO/RCED-86-19, p. ii)

Most states believe that insufficient funds for demonstration projects are an obstacle, to a great extent, to a state's efforts to achieve service integration.

(GAO/HRD-87-110FS, p. 34)

Questions

Are funds that are appropriated effectively targeted to the intended population and spent efficiently?

Same as above.

Will funding limitations or lack of long-term commitment of funds adversely affect the availability and scope of desired projects?

Problems

Questions

For a period of up to 42 months, the Congress authorized funding for three to five demonstration projects for service integration; the Congress did not, however, appropriate funds for such projects. HHS, therefore, used discretionary funds for the five projects. Uncertainties over continued funding after the first year halted efforts to build local community support.
(GAO/HRD-86-125BR, p. 7)

Same as above.

Because of limitations, including funding, some training programs under the Job Training Partnership Act could not be offered and some were shorter than they should have been.
(GAO/HRD-86-16, pp. 27, 29-30, and 36)

Same as above.

Some programs are criticized for variations, considered inequitable, in benefit amounts. For example, states individually set AFDC benefit levels that vary widely between and within states and cause differences in the amounts of benefits received by similarly situated families.
(GAO/HRD-87-51BR, pp. 16-17)

For those programs for which the states establish eligibility or benefits criteria or both (within federal limits, for example, AFDC or Medicaid), are legislative provisions needed to ensure equitable treatment of similarly situated recipients?

Higher federal Medicaid cost-sharing rates for low-income states have not been sufficient to offset these states' lesser ability to pay Medicaid costs. There are, therefore, interstate variations in services provided.
(GAO/HRD-87-67BR, p. 41)

Same as above.

GAO WELFARE REPORTS BY DIVISION:
OCTOBER 1984 TO AUGUST 1987

<u>Title</u>	<u>Report number</u>	<u>Date</u>
<u>Human Resources Division</u>		
<u>Welfare Simplification: States' Views on Coordinating Services for Low-Income Families</u>	HRD-87-110FS	07/29/87
<u>Welfare Eligibility: Deficit Reduction Act Income Verification Issues</u>	HRD-87-79FS	05/26/87
<u>Medicaid: Interstate Variations in Benefits and Expenditures</u>	HRD-87-67BR	05/04/87
<u>Welfare: Issues to Consider in Assessing Proposals for Reform</u>	HRD-87-51BR	02/19/87
<u>Child Support: Need to Improve Efforts to Identify Fathers and Obtain Support Orders</u>	HRD-87-37	04/30/87
<u>Work and Welfare: Current AFDC Work Programs and Implications for Federal Policy</u>	HRD-87-34	01/29/87
<u>Child Support: States' Progress in Implementing the 1984 Amendments</u>	HRD-87-11	10/03/86
<u>Welfare Simplification: Service Integration Demonstrations Under the 1984 Deficit Reduction Act</u>	HRD-86-125BR	08/29/86
<u>Welfare Simplification: Projects to Coordinate Services for Low-Income Families</u>	HRD-86-124FS	08/29/86
<u>Managing Welfare: Issues and Alternatives for Reforming Quality Control Systems</u>	HRD-86-117BR	08/29/86

<u>Title</u>	<u>Report number</u>	<u>Date</u>
<u>Needs-Based Programs: Eligibility and Benefits Factors</u>	HRD-86-107FS	07/09/86
<u>School Dropouts: The Extent and Nature of the Problem</u>	HRD-86-106BR	06/23/86
<u>Low-Income Energy Assistance: State Responses to 1984 Amendments</u>	HRD-86-92	05/16/86
<u>Child and Family Welfare: Selected HHS Discretionary Grant Funding in Fiscal Year 1985</u>	HRD-86-87FS	04/10/86
<u>Job Training Partnership Act: Data Collection Efforts and Needs</u>	HRD-86-69BR	03/31/86
<u>Employment Service: More Jobseekers Should Be Referred to Private Employment Agencies</u>	HRD-86-61	03/31/86
<u>Emergency Jobs Act of 1983: Projects Funded in Cleveland, Ohio, Metropolitan Area</u>	HRD-86-43	01/13/86
<u>Child Support: States' Implementation of the 1984 Child Support Enforcement Amendments</u>	HRD-86-40BR	12/24/85
<u>The Job Training Partnership Act: An Analysis of Support Cost Limits and Participant Characteristics</u>	HRD-86-16	11/06/85
<u>Evidence Is Insufficient to Support the Administration's Proposed Changes to AFDC Work Programs</u>	HRD-85-92	08/27/85
<u>Concerns Within the Job Training Community Over Labor's Ability to Implement the Job Training Partnership Act</u>	HRD-85-61	04/22/85

<u>Title</u>	<u>Report number</u>	<u>Date</u>
<u>Projects Funded in the Montgomery, Alabama, Metropolitan Area by the Emergency Jobs Appropriations Act of 1983</u>	HRD-85-59	05/07/85
<u>Projects Funded in Northeast Texas by the Emergency Jobs Appropriations Act of 1983</u>	HRD-85-42	03/26/85
<u>State Rather Than Federal Policies Provided the Framework for Managing Block Grants</u>	HRD-85-36	03/15/85
<u>Block Grants Brought Funding Changes and Adjustments to Program Priorities</u>	HRD-85-33	02/11/85
<u>Eligibility Verification and Privacy in Federal Benefit Programs: A Delicate Balance</u>	HRD-85-22	03/01/85
<u>U.S. Child Support: Needed Efforts Under Way to Increase Collections From Absent Parents</u>	HRD-85-5	10/30/84
<u>Job Training Partnership Act: Initial Implementation of Program for Disadvantaged Youth and Adults</u>	HRD-85-4	03/04/85
<u>Child Support Collection Efforts for Non-AFDC Families</u>	HRD-85-3	10/30/84
<u>Program Evaluation and Methodology Division</u>		
<u>Noncash Benefits: Initial Results Show Valuation Methods Differentially Affect the Poor</u>	PEMD-87-7BR	10/24/86
<u>Computer Matching: Assessing Its Costs and Benefits</u>	PEMD-87-2	11/10/86

<u>Title</u>	<u>Report number</u>	<u>Date</u>
<u>Teenage Pregnancy: 500,000 Births a Year but Few Tested Programs</u>	PEMD-86-16BR	07/21/86
<u>An Evaluation of the 1981 AFDC Changes: Final Report</u>	PEMD-85-4	07/02/85
<u>Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division</u>		
<u>School Lunch Program: Evaluation of Alternatives to Commodity Donations</u>	RCED-87-113	06/11/87
<u>Food Stamp Program: Result of the Simplified Application Demonstration Project</u>	RCED-87-102	06/11/87
<u>Food Stamp Program: Trends in Program Applications, Participation, and Denials</u>	RCED-87-80BR	04/02/87
<u>Food Stamp Program: Restoration of Improperly Denied or Terminated Benefits</u>	RCED-87-51	10/30/86
<u>Food Stamp Program: Statistical Validity of Agriculture's Payment Error-Rate Estimates</u>	RCED-87-4	10/30/86
<u>Food Stamp Program: Refinements Needed to Improve Accuracy of Quality Control Error Rates</u>	RCED-86-195	09/19/86
<u>School Meal Program: Options for Improving the Verification of Student Eligibility</u>	RCED-86-122BR	03/17/86
<u>Rural Housing: Opportunities to Reduce Costs and Better Target Assistance</u>	RCED-86-33	02/18/86
<u>Low-Income Weatherization-- Better Way of Meeting Needs in View of Limited Funds</u>	RCED-86-19	10/31/85

<u>Title</u>	<u>Report number</u>	<u>Date</u>
<u>Benefit Overpayments: Recoveries Could Be Increased in the Food Stamp and AFDC Programs</u>	RCED-86-17	03/14/86
<u>Overview and Perspectives on the Food Stamp Program</u>	RCED-85-109	04/17/85
<u>Need to Foster Optimal Use of Resources in the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)</u>	RCED-85-105	09/27/85
<u>Quality Control Error Rates for the Food Stamp Program</u>	RCED-85-98	04/12/85

(105446)



Requests for copies of GAO publications should be sent to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
Post Office Box 6015
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20877

Telephone 202-275-6241

The first five copies of each publication are free. Additional copies are \$2.00 each.

There is a 25% discount on orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address.

Orders must be prepaid by cash or by check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents.

United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

Address Correction Requested

<p>First-Class Mail Postage & Fees Paid GAO Permit No. G100</p>
